1	R. Scott Erlewine, State Bar No. 095106 rse@phillaw.com		
2	Nicholas A. Carlin, State Bar No. 112532		
3	Brian S. Conlon, State Bar No. 303456 bsc@phillaw.com		
4	PHILLIPS, ERLEWINE, GIVEN & CARLIN LLP 39 Mesa Street, Suite 201		
5	The Presidio		
6	San Francisco, CA 94129 Telephone: 415-398-0900		
7	Fax: 415-398-0911		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
12			
13	LENZA H. MCELRATH III, individually	Case No. 3:16-cv-07241-JSC	
14	and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION	
15	Plaintiffs,		
16	VS.	NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTION OR PROCEEDING PURSUANT	
17	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	TO LOCAL RULE 3-13	
18	OBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.		
19	Defendant.		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTION – Case No. 3:16-cv-07241-JSC

Defendant of the pendency of other actions or proceedings:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1. On May 2, 2016, plaintiff Lenza H. McElrath III filed an action against Defendant Ube
Technologies, Inc. in California Superior Court (City and County of San Francisco), styled Lenza
H. McElrath III v. Uber Technologies, Inc., Case No. CGC-16-551748. The state action presently
alleges a single cause of action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Ac
(California Labor Code §2698, et. seq "PAGA"), seeking to recover penalties for Defendant'

violation of California Labor Code § 970 for alleged misrepresentations involving stock options

made to induce plaintiff and other recruits to relocate to accept employment with Defendant.

Pursuant to Local Rule 3-13, Plaintiff Lenza H. McElrath III hereby notifies the Court and

On December 19, 2016, Plaintiff McElrath filed this federal action against Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc., alleging that Defendant systematically breached its standardized employment agreements by 1) promising employees, such as plaintiff, one type of stock option, but after joining the company granting them a far less valuable type of stock option; and 2) imposing severe limits on the promised time frames that employees can exercise their options. The federal complaint alleges claims for breach of contract, breach of the implied good faith covenant, false promise, misrepresentation, violation of California Labor Code § 970 and violation of California Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200). The state court PAGA claim overlaps the claim for violation of Labor Code §970 alleged in this action, but seeks penalties rather than damages; both claims are limited to employees who actually relocated to accept employment. The myriad other claims alleged in this federal action are substantially broader, and include all putative class members who were victimized by Defendant's conduct whether or not they relocated. Plaintiff does not believe that the proceedings should be coordinated.

## Case 3:16-cv-07241-JSC Document 13 Filed 01/13/17 Page 3 of 4

1	Section 8(a)(1) of the Act. The charge alleges that Uber has enforced the dispute resolution		
2	agreement in the state court PAGA action. Plaintiff does not believe that the proceedings should		
3	be coordinated.		
4			
5	Dated: January 13, 2017	PHILLIPS, ERLEWINE, GIVEN & CARLIN LLP	
6			
7		By: /s/ R. Scott Erlewine R. Scott Erlewine	
8	Nicholas A. Carlin Brian S. Conlon Attorneys for Plaintiff	Nicholas A. Carlin Brian S. Conlon	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

PHILLIPS, ERLEWINE, GIVEN & CARLIN, LLP 39 Mesa Street, Suite 201
San Francisco, CA 94129 (415) 398-0900